The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. X. ST. LOUIS, MO., DECEMBER 17, 1903. NO. 48.

LITERARY CRITICISM IN CATHOLIC NEWSPAPERS.

IN our No. 44 we published a short article under the above heading, in which we censured three prominent Catholic contemporaries for misleading their readers with regard to the works of Parkman, Bulwer-Lytton, and Thackeray. We took the ground that there is no "use of having a Catholic press at all if it does not instruct the Catholic public in the truth, but simply re-echoes the errors and lies of secular newspapers and magazines."

It is characteristic of a portion of our press that not only did the three newspapers criticized not deem it worth while to correct the blunders into which they had fallen; but another, the *Pittsburg Observer*, thought it necessary to come to the rescue of one of the censured organs, the *Catholic Journal* of Memphis, by printing the subjoined delectable bit of literary polemics (No. 27):

"(1.) It is amusing to note the lofty air of superiority which the bumptious and self-conceited editor of a tiny western sheet assumes when he undertakes—as he frequently does—the task of criticizing his betters. His most recent effusion opened in this style: 'We have resigned ourselves in some degree to philosophical and theological inaccuracies and blunders in our Catholic American newspapers; but though the incompetence of the editors in these higher sciences deprives them of the capacity for much good, it would be a consolation to think that they were at least well trained in literary matters and did their best to cultivate a correct taste in their readers and to give them reliable information about what they should read. Unfortunately, some are ignorant and indiscriminate even on this subject.' (2.) Then he goes on to demonstrate with unconscious frankness his own incompetence to discuss literary matters with an average degree of intelligence,

much less to dictate to others in this connection. (3.) Carping at a statement made by the *Catholic Journal* of Memphis, Tenn., regarding the works of Bulwer-Lytton, he quotes what somebody else said about them. This is what was said: 'To all his novels there is the strong moral objection that they are the deification of worldly success as if that were the paramount object of life.' The megacephalous editor of the tiny sheet, not having read Bulwer-Lytton's novels, evidently takes this statement to be true; for he goes on to declare that 'the same objection, let us add by the way, holds good against,' etc. If he knew anything about Bulwer-Lytton's novels he would be aware that the sweeping objection 'to all' of them which has been quoted is ridiculously unfounded. All his best novels—those written in maturer life—such as 'Ernest Maltravers,' 'Night and Morning,' 'Rienzi'—inculcate moral lessons of a high order. The keynote of one of these is: 'Be honest in temptation, and in adversity have faith in God.' "

What we had written on the subject of Bulwer-Lytton was this: "..... the Memphis *Catholic Journal* (whose editor, Mr. Wm. Fitzgerald, has since died: the Lord give him eternal rest!) answered the query: 'Please state in what manner the Catholic Church regards the works of Lord Bulwer-Lytton?' thus (No. 20): 'As those of an able, brilliant, and exceptionally clever writer, but some of his works, especially 'Morton Devereux,' are so thoroughly bigoted and anti-Catholic, and give such a false and malicious idea of Catholic priests and Catholic teachings that they are unfit for perusal. Lytton, however, had *one redeeming trait, he did not pander to the immoral taste of the time.*'—(Italics mine.—A. P.) Now, it is well known to all serious students of literature that Bulwer-Lytton's earlier novels deserve to be 'censured as immoral or deficient in genuine art.' (Cfr. Jenkins' Handbook of British and American Lit., 13th ed., p. 380), and that to 'all his novels there is the strong moral objection that they are a deification of worldly success, as if that were the paramount object of life.' (Ibid.)"

Our readers will probably agree with us that the Pittsburg paper's insolent remarks are hardly worth noticing, except in so far as they are symptomatic and offer one more argument in proof of our thesis, that some of our Catholic newspaper editors "are ignorant and indiscriminate" not only in subjects philosophical and theological (which we have often shown before), but also "in literary matters," and therefore unable to perform one of the most important duties of their responsible office, viz., "to cultivate a correct taste in their readers and to give them reliable information about what to read."*)

*) The unscholarly slovenliness of our critic appears not only from the substance and tone of his tirade, but also from the fact that he has not quoted our words in full, and that he does not cite us correctly even where he uses quotation marks.

We have inserted a few numbers into the text of our critic's article, in order to make our own retort more intelligible.

1. As for the "*tiny* western sheet": Is it necessary for a periodical to cover a dozen or more square yards of paper to be a foeman worthy of the *Pittsburg Observer's* steel? May it not be love of truth and justice rather than a "lofty air of superiority," that leads us to reprove faults and to correct errors wherever we find them in the public press?

2. We have never attempted "to dictate to others" in literary or other matters. And as for our competence "to discuss literary matters with an average degree of intelligence," despite long and patient reading we are so timid about asserting more than we can prove, that we make it a practice, as our readers know, to quote recognized authorities whenever we proceed to criticize.

3. We took the same precaution in the article attacked by the Pittsburg writer, and it would have been only fair of him to tell his readers that the "somebody else" whom we quoted on Bulwer-Lytton, was Jenkins, whose 'Handbook of British and American Literature' is a standard work in use in many of our colleges and high-schools. It is a good many years since we dipped into Bulwer's numerous novels, and we have neither the leisure nor the inclination to-day to re-read 'Ernest Maltravers' or 'Night and Morning' or 'Rienzi,' for the sake of establishing, with profuse textual citations, or by way of laborious analysis, against an anonymous and flippant critic, a thesis which has the approval of competent Catholic critics.*) We will only note in passing that of the three novels cited by the Pittsburg writer as among the "best" of Bulwer-Lytton's, 'Ernest Maltravers' is condemned even by honest non-Catholic critics. Chambers' well-known 'Cyclopedia of English Literature,' for instance, says of 'Ernest Maltravers,' that it illustrates "what, though rare in novels, is common in human life—the affliction of the good, *the triumph of the unprincipled.*" The character of Maltravers is described as "far from pleasing," and Alice Darvil is "evidently a copy from Byron's Haidee."....."Ferrers, the villain of the tale, is also a Byronic creation; and, on the whole, the violent contrasts and gloomy delineations of this novel render it more akin to the spurious offspring of sentimental romance, than to the family of the genuine English novel." In the sentence immediately following, Chambers says: "A continuation of this work (viz., 'Ernest Maltravers') was given in the following year" (1838) "under

---

*) Even such a benign critic as Father Charles Coppens, S. J., while flatly condemning "Bulwer's early novels" as "objectionable," does not recommend "his later ones" as inculcating "moral lessons of a high order," and therefore fit reading for Catholics, but merely allows that they "are better" than the author's previous productions. [English Rhetoric, 3rd ed., p. 213.]

the title of 'Alice, or the Mysteries,' with no improvement as to literary power or *correct moral philosophy*....."*) (Italics ours.)

Are we to be less discriminating in our literary and moral standards than Protestants?

And we repeat it: "What is the use of having a Catholic press at all if it does not instruct the Catholic public in the truth, but simply re-echoes the errors and lies of secular newspapers and magazines?"

We can not conclude this already too long-drawn-out article without expressing our gratification at the fact that a few at least of the better-class Catholic papers have repeated our query and cordially support our contention. We may refer to the note on Parkman which we reproduced last week (p. 752) from the *Northwest Review*, and end with the brief but pungent comment made upon our query by the Buffalo *Catholic Union and Times* (No. 35):

"It would be mere folly to close one's eyes to the bald fact that too many so-calied Catholic papers are in large part re-echoes of the lies and errors of secular newspapers and magazines. There are too many such papers; well were it for the cause of religion if they had never been born,—or, that unfortunately having happened, if they would speedily die."

THE TAXATION OF CHURCH PROPERTY.

(*Concluded.*)

We are told that the exemption of church property from taxation involves a union of Church and State, which is at variance with our principle of government and un-American. The primary assertion is denied. The phrase "Church and State," much used and frequently, for partisan purposes, perverted from its plain sense and meaning, is commonly and fairly understood to imply the recognition or establishment by a government of some particular form of religious worship, which the State directly and professedly supports by grants of public money or of lands or by the appropriation of tithes or other forms of tax levied upon all the inhabitants without exception for the maintenance of such established religion, to the exclusion of every other form of worship. Moreover, the union of Church and State, as we know it to have existed in our early history, has been accompanied invariably by legislation designed to force the appointed State religion upon the conscience of all the inhabitants, by subjecting to various civil disabilities every one who refused to accept such State Church and partici-

*) Chambers, 'Cyclopedia of English Literature,' Boston ed. of 1847, vol. ii, p. 621.

pate in its worship,—not to speak of the barbarous penal laws which disgraced some of our colonies in which Church and State were most firmly united.

We do not think that we have overstated the characteristics of a State-established Church, and if this is what is implied in the union of Church and State, of which the Church's enemies are so apprehensive—and what else can there be?—we readily grant that such a union would be un-American and at variance with that most cherished principle of our government, religious toleration.

But we are at a loss to see how any union of Church and State can result from the universal exemption of church property from taxation. The State exempts not any one, but all churches equally. It gives no favor or preference to any. In its tax legislation it recognizes no church or denomination by name or in fact, and if a church may be deemed a State Church merely because its property is exempted from taxation, then every body of worshippers who are organized into a church and whose property, used for religious purposes, is exempted from taxation, becomes *ipso facto* a State Church equally with every other body of worshippers and irrespective of creeds or forms of worship, Instead of the union of the State and a single Church acknowledged and protected by the State, which is the essential feature of Church and State, there is a union (if so it may be called) of the State with all churches, however divergent and in many respects contradictory their creeds, by which all are left to follow their several methods of worship, free from any legal restraint and without any aid from the State other than the exemption from taxation which is equally and uniformly allowed to all. To describe such a condition as a union of Church and State is a misuse of words and the very absurdity of religious prejudice.

But we are told that the exemption of church property is inequitable in that a portion of the community is thus favored at the expense of others, who are not interested; and the instance is cited of the atheist who believes that the influence of religion is "vicious and detrimental" (*Green Bag*, p. 416).

The atheist is undoubtedly free under our laws to hold his own opinion of the value of religious influence in promoting the welfare of the people, but he is a very small minority in the whole number of human beings of whatever race or nation, and so long as he chooses to live under our system of government, he and his class must submit, as every minority is bound to submit, to the will of the vast majority, deliberately expressed, determining that it is for the best interests of the entire nation that the people should be encouraged to the worship of an Almighty God and to that end

that their temples for divine worship should be exempted from taxation.

Our friends, the Quakers, do not believe in war, yet we have never heard of their resisting the payment of war taxes lawfully imposed for the defence of the nation. The unmarried persons who have no children to send to the schools maintained by the State, might complain of the injustice of compelling them to pay taxes for the support of an institution in which they have no interest and from which, as they might claim, they derive no benefit. But government, looking to the general welfare of all the people and to the greatest good of the greatest number of its citizens, has determined by its established policy and by its legislation, that the State as a whole has an interest in the education of its youth, and in the observance of those moral laws which religion inculcates and which are equally the foundation of society and of all civil government. For the accomplishment of these and all other necessary aims and purposes, the State taxes the property in general of all classes of citizens, with certain well-defined and justifiable exceptions. No system of taxation has ever been or can be devised for a government of seventy millions of people, but will offend in some respects against the principles or prejudices of particular individuals or classes. If the well-established policy of exemption of church property, founded in reason and justified by experience, is objected to by the atheist, we need only answer that it suits the majority of the people, who are not atheists even if all are not church-goers; and the suggestion that practically a whole nation believing in a Supreme Being and invoking His help and guidance in their affairs, as they have done from the very foundation of our government, should yield their respect for His worship and make it conditional on the payment of taxes at the demand of a handful of men who assert that there is no God: is little short of impertinence.

The final and presumably strongest objection advanced by the writer in the *Green Bag* against the exemption of church property, is that the policy of exemption "involves a liability to the accumulation of great wealth," to be held by never-dying corporations independent of the State, and which may be used against it, "possibly subject to foreign control."

The danger from foreign control, the writer concedes, is "not imminent or serious." We agree with him. Fifty years ago children were frightened, and not a few of their weak-minded elders were alarmed, by stories of this apprehended "foreign intervention," which, under the leadership of the Pope and with the help of the Jesuits and the alms of the Leopoldine Society, was to subjugate the liberties of this Republic. But the Republic managed

to escape without any foreign interference then or since, and the Church passed unscathed through the fire of calumny which sought her destruction. That the advocates of church taxation should employ these forgotten catch-words of the anti-Catholic crusade of former days, can hardly add weight to their arguments.

Equally unjustified is the statement that the Church, which is (possibly) to accumulate this great wealth, through its exemption from tax, is independent of the State. On this point, and touching the objection generally, we remark as follows:

The policy embodied in the legislation of the various States exempts from taxation property belonging to corporations or associations which are organized for religious, charitable, benevolent, or educational purposes, besides in many States a variety of societies organized for literary, historical, scientific, and similar ends. Now, be it observed, these exemptions are granted in favor of property held not by individuals but by corporations or associations which are artificial persons created by the State, subject to its control and to the visitation of its officials, limited as to the amount of property which they may acquire and hold, and liable to dissolution at the instance of the State and to sequestration of their property for any misuse of their corporate privileges. Far from the church corporation, therefore, being independent of the State, as urged, we find it dependent on the State for its very existence and bound to conform in the administration of its property to all regulations which the State may impose.

Moreover, in order that their privileges should not be abused and that the religious and other societies which are thus favored should manage their property in conformity with the professed purpose for which they were created, the law-makers have provided that no such exemption from taxation shall be allowed where the society is maintained with a view to making a pecuniary profit for its members or officers, nor unless it is conducted in good faith for its declared purpose; nor shall the exemption apply to any real estate which yields rent or income. This is the general rule and practice in New York, which fairly represents the enlightened public sentiment of the time on this question of church taxation. In many other States of the Union equally liberal principles prevail. In none is there any church corporation enjoying the favor of the State by way of immunity from taxation and at the same time independent of the State as regards the use of its property.

Exemption from taxation is held to be a privilege which the sovereign power grants, and which it has the right at any time to withdraw. We have discussed the question from a point of view which is common to all who believe in the Deity. When we ascend

to higher ground and consider the claims of Christianity in general, and the still higher and distinct claims of the one true Church, as the teacher of morals, the protector of the family, and the unrelenting foe of social disorder, we are convinced that the State could take no more disastrous step than to reverse its policy of exempting God's house from taxation. P. C.

THE "TEMPLE-BUILDER" IN MASONRY.

We have seen on a former occasion that the orientation or east and west position of the lodge, is not due to the Jewish temple or tabernacle, but to the old heathen custom of the ancients. On pp. 112, 113, and 114 of our guide, Mackey's Masonic Ritualist, we are informed that the idea of the "Masonic temple-builder" is derived from a like pagan source.

"The idea of the legend" (of the temple-builder) it says, "was undoubtedly borrowed from the ancient mysteries, where the lesson was the same as that conveyed in the third degree of Masonry..... For the temple-builder is, in the Masonic system, the symbol of humanity, developed here and in the life to come; and as the Temple is the visible symbol of the world, its architect becomes the mythical symbol of man, the dweller and worker in the world, and his progress by the gates is the allegory of man's pilgrimage through youth, manhood and old age, to the final triumph of death and the grave. The number twelve was celebrated as a mystical number in the ancient systems of sun worship, of which it has already been said that Masonry is a philosophic development. The number there referred to the twelve signs of the zodiac, and in these Masonic rites in which the builder is made the symbol of the sun, the twelve F.·. C.·. refer to the twelve signs in which alone the sun is to be sought for. But in the York rite this symbolism is lost, because Hiram there represents man and not the sun."

Our reader is not perhaps aware that among the seven sciences which Masonry is said to teach, logic alone represents philosophy; hence when we are told that Masonry is the philosophical development of the ancient pagan systems, we can not but understand the term as the logical development. The idea of builder, which is but another name for Mason, is therefore, as our author informs us, undoubtedly derived from paganism, and is hence its logical product. The difference of rites or the difference of symbolism does not in any way affect the substance of the matter.

The York rite is but a fuller and clearer development of inferior forms—humanity the child of physical light—the upbuilder of it-

self—free in the indulgence of its appetites, where detriment to health is not involved—the recipient of the sun's heat and its noblest exponent upon earth. Whether Hiram represents the sun or humanity, the meaning is radically the same: sun-worship gives naturally birth to phallic worship.

SPONTANEOUS COMBUSTION.

The reader has doubtless heard of wet hay igniting or refuse from coal mines beginning to burn without apparent cause. Many buildings are believed to have been set on fire by incendiaries, yet may not the same cause have been at work that ignites the wet haystack or a pile of coal slack? The present writer was surprised not long ago to find the church building under his charge suddenly filled with smoke; and the cause? Two cotton rags soaked with oil had been thrown together. They burned with a black fire (without flame) which had already eaten a hole through the floor when it was accidentally discovered.

In the interest of readers who may have had a similar experience or who take a scientific interest in this subject, we reprint parts of an article from the *Independent* (p. 2,073) on spontaneous combustion as a fire hazard:

Spontaneous combustion arises because of the absorption of oxygen from the atmosphere by various substances having an affinity for it. The evaporation of certain oils, especially vegetable oils, such as linseed, rapeseed, almond and palm oil, as well as the drying of moist charcoal, results in the rapid absorption of oxygen to the extent of ignition. None of these substances are dangerous in bulk, as in barrels or cans, but the danger arises when any of the oils are distributed over fibrous substances, such as rags, cotton waste, etc. They form an especially hazardous risk when covered up so as to confine the generated heat. Petroleum products are likewise dangerous on account of their vaporizing qualities and ignitibility.

Sawdust mixed with linseed oil will ignite in a few hours. Cotton waste saturated with linseed oil will burn through the agency of spontaneous combustion in from two to ten hours, according to circumstances. With some of the other oils named the ignition is even more rapid and takes place in from five to six hours as a maximum.

Silk waste is more dangerous than is cotton. Wet cotton, damp oatmeal or bran, and, in fact, most vegetable substances, when packed together in a confined place without being sufficiently dry, undergo fermentation or heating, and are liable to take fire. Ship-

ments of cotton are thus extra hazardous marine risks, and because of a tendency toward spontaneous combustion may account for some unexplained losses of ships. Spent tanbark is liable to ignite spontaneously when stacked in heaps. Iron filings, to which moisture has access, generate heat; iron rust is combustion or oxidation of iron. An instance was recently cited by Francis C. Moore, wherein a large machine shop was flooded by a sudden freshet, which thoroughly wetted heaps of iron scraps or shavings upon the floor of the shop. They began to heat from the rusting immediately after the water had subsided.

The spontaneous ignition of coal mines is supposed to be due to the chemical action of water and iron pyrites. Unslacked lime is subject to spontaneous ignition when dampened in any way. Charcoal will burn when pulverized or divided. Indeed, a ton or two in a state of minute division is almost certain to ignite spontaneously.

Lamp-black is dangerous, as there is very little doubt of its liability to ignite spontaneously if mixed with oils which contain a large proportion of hydrogen.

Tracing paper, made transparent with oil in process of manufacture, if the sheets are not thoroughly dry and cool before piling, will take fire within an hour on account of the linseed oil used.

Roasted coffee sometimes takes fire spontaneously. Hay, when stored away too green or wet, is very liable to set barns on fire by the heat generated in fermentation. Tarred felt and moist hemp have been known to take fire spontaneously. Many of the fires originating in broom-corn warehouses are supposed to arise from spontaneous combustion resulting from the saturation of the fiber with oil from the seed, expressed by the process of baling and handling, and the numerous fires in cotton gin houses may be largely due to the ignition of cotton saturated with oil from the cotton seed expressed during the process.

From the few examples cited it will be quite evident that spontaneous combustion as a moving cause from which fires result, is more prevalent than laymen have been accustomed to suppose.

* * *

——'Luther und das Lutherthum' is the title of an important new work by P. Denifle, O. P., sub-archivist of the Vatican Library, of which the first volume has just been issued. It portrays the father of modern Protestantism with a steel pencil, and we notice expressions of regret in the Catholic papers of Germany that the reverend author has diminished the possible good effects of his work by his severely polemical style.

BOOK REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTES.

Plain Facts for Fair Minds. By Rev. George M. Searle, C. S. P., Book Catholic Exchange. New York. Price 10 cts.

Plain Facts for Fair Minds deserves the large patronage it has received. (The copy before us is from the 426th thousand.) We have perused it with interest from cover to cover and must say, only a convert is able to point out the objections non-Catholics make against our religion as Father Searle has done it. However, we stumbled over some passages that need correction.

The following sentence on p. 44 is defective in style: "I trust then, that this much misunderstood subject ought to be somewhat clearer to those who may read what has been just said than it was before."

On p. 49, the sentence beginning in the third line with: "But I do," etc., should be rendered plainer. As it stands, it takes a scholar to make out its meaning. What is said on p. 62 about Christian instruction being secret, i. e., given only to those that were baptized, is not quite correct. The following phrase on p. 67 should also be amended: The Incarnation "means simply that the Son of God, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, took our human nature, and became man as well as God, in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ." On p. 80: "To say that her remains were hid away, as the Jews pretended that those of Christ were, would merely be saying that Romanism began very early, and was indeed identified with Christianity itself," is likewise objectionable. Page 148, at the bottom, gives a wrong description of what is properly called a martyr. Page 289: "Our assent to the teachings of the Church is really an act similar to the assent which both you and we make to Stanley's discoveries in Central Africa," requires rectification. Page 339: "The rites of the Catholic Church are surely not more magnificent than those of Solomon's temple," is an assertion of very doubtful validity.

The worst blunder Father Searle makes on page 60, where he confounds the fountains of divine revelation and the living teaching authority, the Church. He says: "The Church, then, and the Holy Scriptures are simply our means for finding out what the doctrine of the Apostles was. And it must not be imagined that we trust more to the Church than to the Bible. In point of fact the Bible is for us, as well as for the Protestants, the higher authority of the two; for its teaching is inspired by the Holy Ghost, whereas that of the Pope or of the Church is merely preserved from error by Him...." "To these two great fountain sources of Christian truth another may be added with evident propriety.

This is what we call tradition." Any elementary treatise on Christian doctrine will show where the error of this statement lies.

The Gift of Pentecost. Meditations on the Holy Ghost. By M. Meschler, S. J. Translated from the German by Lady Amabel Kerr. B. Herder. Price $1.60.

One of the great books of our day. The learned and pious author has accomplished a remarkable task. He has opened up, laid bare, made plain to the ordinary reader those secret sources of truth, the very simplicity of which constitutes their mysteriousness and veils them from our eyes. Father Meschler goes step by step from the contemplation of the attributes of the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity to the study of His activity in the universe and His operations in the souls of men. Each meditation is complete in itself, yet an integral part of the whole treatise. Perhaps the climax is reached in the chapters on the two great hymns to the Holy Ghost. The creators of these two immortal peans must indeed have been pure in heart. They would almost seem to have enjoyed the beatific vision here below. Father Meschler addresses his work to all Catholics, especially priests and religious. Let us hope that many a layman will find his way to this treasure house. Then a prayer to the Holy Ghost, a little attention, and the exertion of those very same mental powers which serve us so well in the pursuit of the perishable pleasures of the imagination, would soon encourage to a sturdy growth that taste for the truth which the Holy Spirit plants in our souls with the gift of wisdom. It would be ungracious not to mention the admirable work of the translator, whose version leaves nothing to be desired.

The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. By Cardinal Bona, O. C. Edited by the Right Rev. Ildephonsus Cummins, O. S. B. Price 30 cts.

The Divine Office. A Letter to a Priest. Edited by the Right Rev. Ildephonsus Cummins, O. S. B. Price 30 cts. London: Art and Book Company. St. Louis: B. Herder.

These two little volumes, whose contents richly fulfill the promise conveyed by their attractive appearance, belong to the series issued by the Art and Book Company under the name of the Paternoster Books. Both treatises are short but full of devotion, and above all thoroughly practical. They are well fitted to attain their object, which is to inspire the reader with reverence and love for the great acts of worship of the Church and to derive from them all the benefits in which they are so fruitful.

——'A History of Catholicity in Northern Ohio and in the Diocese of Cleveland. From 1749 to December 31st, 1900, by the Rev. George F. Houck, Diocesan Chancellor,' of which the two sumptuous volumes have reached us, is, in its historical portion (volume I.), deserving of high praise. It will undoubtedly prove, as Bishop Horstmann says in his "Approbation," "a model for the other dioceses of the country," and will, we hope, "incite capable men everywhere to take up the same character of work and carry it out with equal diligence and success." Father Houck has the gift and temper of the true historian. As soon as space permits, we shall show by the reproduction of one of his chapters, how judiciously he treats delicate topics. The second volume, containing stilted and apparently paid-for-at-so-much-per-line eulogies, falsely called biographies, of "prominent" Catholics, by Mr. Michael W. Carr, is not, we regret to say, up to the standard of the first.

——The Abbé Loisy has published a pamphlet attempting to justify his much-discussed book. We notice that our friend Rev. Dr. Charles Maignen in *La Vérité Française*, and the Jesuit Fathers of the *Etudes* are treating him to some strong criticism, which will probably result in both of Loisy's unfortunate productions being put on the 'Index librorum prohibitorum,' where they belong. The Roman *Voce della Verità*, in an apparently inspired article, intimates that this will ultimately be their fate,

——The second volume has just appeared of Dr. Joseph Pohle's 'Lehrbuch der Dogmatik.' The work is thoroughly orthodox and up-to-date, and we must say that of all theological hand-books we have ever perused, it is the most interestingly written. The Catholic University of America lost a most eminent theologian when Dr. Pohle, unable longer to stand the chicanery to which he was subjected, resigned his professorship and went back to his native Germany.

——We have to thank our friend *M.* Tardivel of *La Vérité* for a copy of 'L'Histoire du Canada en 200 Leçons, par le P. Ph.-F. Bourgeois, de la Congregation de Sainte-Croix,' just published by Beauchemin of Montreal, and to which we hope to do justice by and by.

——Rev. P. Hartmann Grisar, S. J., has just prepared a new and thoroughly revised edition of his book on Luther published a number of years ago under the pen-name "Germanus." It paints the "reformer" from the coign of vantage of the psychologist.

——It may be of interest for some readers of THE REVIEW that the sixth edition of the excellent Compendium of Sacred Liturgy written by Rev. P. Innocent Wapelhorst, O. F. M., is under press and will be published in the near future.

MINOR TOPICS.

A Question of Morality.—The *Catholic Telegraph* (No. 48), commenting on the dedication of a church erected by the steel magnate Charles Schwab, at a cost of $125,000, (the organ, costing $10,000, was donated by Mr. Andrew Carnegie), expresses it as its honest opinion that "their acceptance is a stench and a scandal to Catholicity. The millions of Schwab and Carnegie"—it says—"are ill-gotten gains. No man in a lifetime can become the possessor of honest millions by catering to the wants of the general public. He either capitalizes the necessities of the people at large, or he does not give his employés their proper share in the product of their labor. In either case his enormous wealth is dishonestly got. In the former he sins against society, in the latter he sins against individuals; in both he sins against God, the Founder of society and the Creator of man"...."We are well aware that there are many wealthy men who came by their riches in honest ways. We know, also, that 'the poor we have always with us.' And we believe that the honestly rich do hold their wealth in trust from the Almighty. But we maintain that the vast majority of capitalists piled up their wealth by dishonest methods, and that the number of poor has been increased a thousandfold by the avarice and corruption of the rich....."

"There is altogether too much pandering to wealth on the part of some ecclesiastics. Consequently we have a great defection from the Church among the middle and poorer classes."....."We wonder at the growth of Socialism. Have we any reason to wonder? Is it not growing fastest where the pulpits are continually preaching patience and resignation to labor, and neglecting to tell capital that defrauding the laborer of his wages is a sin crying to Heaven for vengeance? Will it not grow all the faster if churches and clergy accept money that has been cursed by oppression of the poor? And when we examine the matter, it is not the wealthy who build and support the churches. It is the poor; and should they not be treated as children in their Father's house?"

There is a vast deal of truth in these considerations.

A straw showing the growing tendency among Christian people to favor some form of religious teaching for the rising generation, is the recommendation of the General Lutheran Council, at its session in Norristown, Pa., on Oct. 12th, that congregations should be encouraged to support kindergarten week-day schools for children up to six years of age.

In most, if not all of the public schools of Pennsylvania, reading of the Bible forms part of the daily instruction. As a matter of course, the Protestant version is in general use, and while the schools are nominally free from sectarian influence, practically most Protestant parents are satisfied that the public school, in connection with the benefit of Sunday school training, is all that their children require in that line. Were it possible to do away with Bible reading in all the public schools, confining instruction there to the spirit as well as the letter of the law, by not permitting religious influence of any kind, it would arouse even the easy-

going Protestant element to a realization of the radical faultiness of the system. Comparatively few people in this country will openly profess themselves infidels; the majority still believe in some form of religion. Deprive them of the excuse that their children receive religious instruction in the public schools, and they would soon join the Catholics in trying to find some way of remedying the trouble. Since votes only count in this country, it were well for the Catholic element to secure the coöperation of believing Protestants in the school question. In that way some satisfactory solution could perhaps be devised.

Reviewing the American books of the year, the *Independent* admits that "the process is disheartening on the whole:"

"There are so many books printed, so many that mean time and labor for the author, labor and money for the publisher, money and time for the reader—and disappointment for all. They lie in a literary office,

'Thick as autumnal leaves that strew the brooks
In Vallombrosa;'

and the chief lesson to be learnt from their coming and going is merely this, that there are vastly too many of them written and printed. They seem to represent no tendency and, as a mass, to illustrate no intellectual aim—we speak of them in the gross, not of the few. And it becomes more apparent every day that Lowell's dictum was right: 'There can be no American literature until we have an American criticism.' It is for this reason that we scan with particular attention the critical works that come before us and count them of special importance. Unfortunately, the present year has produced not a single American book of this sort in any way really notable."

The irrepressible Mr. Scharff is now devoting his attention to the question of uniform text-books for our Catholic schools. We share in his hope, expressed in a recent syndicate letter (v. *Catholic Universe*, No. 1532), that the Catholic University will soon publish a reliable school history of the United States; but if he thinks any text-book can be gotten up that will suit the managers of all our schools and find universal introduction, he is egregiously mistaken. Nor is uniformity beyond the limits of a diocese, or at most a province, either necessary or particularly desirable. We argued this question with the *Catholic Columbian* some years ago, but our contemporary did not offer one substantial reason why uniform text-books are worth striving for or how a satisfactory set for the whole country could be devised. Even within the bounds of a single diocese, a reader or history admirably suited for city schools, may be quite unadapted to the wants of ungraded schools in the country.

In an address to the students of St. Ignatius College, Cleveland, Archbishop Ireland said (*Catholic Universe*, No. 1532):

"We Catholics, on the whole, have been too modest in our aspirations; the highest and best ought not to be too high and too

good for us. We want our young men to vie with the first in the land. We wish to see a greater number of Catholics in the councils of the nation and in the halls of learning. The Church of America needs priests, but she needs also educated laymen, and at present there is perhaps a greater need for the latter than for the former....Catholic colleges are best able to teach our youths the great lesson of being loyal citizens and devout Christians. Education is the cry of the day; Catholic education, increase of learning under Catholic instructors, must be our motto."

For once, we agree!

We have the following from Mr. Martin I. J. Griffin of Philadelphia:

"Concerning the documents relating to 'Pius IX. and Our Civil War,' which you republish from the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society*, you pronounce one a 'very poor translation.' I may tell you that the original Latin is not in the Library of Congress. The letters of Mr. Benjamin and Mr. Mann were until a year ago in this city, when I first found out about them. On being secured by the Library of Congress I had all the documents copied, and like you, doubted the proper translation. I had verification, however, as to the accuracy of the copies made for me, which I supplied the *Records*. The original letters of Pius IX. ought to be in the archives of the Archdioceses of New York and New Orleans. The translation was made in one of these."

Rev. Father W. S. Kress shows in the *Catholic Universe* (No. 1532) that Ohio was the cradle of the work of giving missions to non-Catholics (let us do away with the crazy misnomer: "non-Catholic missions"!), as Fathers Wonderly and himself lectured to non-Catholics at Van Buren, Ohio, two months before Father Elliott inaugurated the Paulist movement in Michigan, ten years ago. Father Elliott, however, it seems, was the intellectual father of the movement, for it was in consequence of an article of his in the *Catholic World* Magazine, that Bishop Horstmann, in May 1893, resolved upon instituting a band of missionaries to non-Catholics in his Diocese.

We are very glad to hear that the movement is bringing numerous Protestants and even some infidels into the Catholic fold.

A writer in the *Catholic World* (Dec.) declares that this country, "in its deepest heart," is tenaciously Christian. The statement, he ventures to think, is borne out by the experience of all missionaries to non-Catholics. "There is,"—caustically comments the *Monitor* (No. 10)—"unfortunately, too much hermetically sealed Christianity stowed away in 'deepest' hearts, where it remains absolutely unserviceable for any good and useful purpose whatever."